

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK-----X
LUIS JAIME,

Plaintiff,

- against -

NEW YORK STATE OFFICERS, *et al.*,Defendants.
-----X

24 Civ. 266 (DEH) (GS)

ORDER**GARY STEIN, United States Magistrate Judge:**

The Court is in receipt of an April 11, 2024 letter from the *pro se* Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 11). In that letter, Plaintiff indicates that he is unsure whether the Court received his response to Judge Ho's *Valentin* Order dated March 18, 2024. (*See* Dkt. No. 7). Plaintiff does not say what that response consisted of, but the Court notes that an Amended Complaint, signed by Plaintiff on March 27, 2024, was filed on the docket on April 4, 2024. (Dkt. No. 10).

As an initial matter, the Court notes that Plaintiff was not required to respond to Judge Ho's *Valentin* Order at this time. Rather, the *Valentin* Order directs the New York State Attorney General's Office to ascertain the identities of the officers that Plaintiff seeks to sue in this case and the addresses where they may be served. (*See id.* at 1-2). The Attorney General's Office is required to provide that information to Plaintiff and the Court by May 17, 2024. (*Id.* at 2). *After* the Attorney General's Office provides this information, Plaintiff is *then* required by the *Valentin* Order to file an Amended Complaint naming the officers as Defendants. (*Id.*).

Although Plaintiff was not required to file his Amended Complaint on April 4, 2024, the Court notes that it contains additional information concerning the officers he wishes to sue, including the rank and last name of one officer, the first name of another officer, some of the clothing worn by the officers, and the last names of other officers who witnessed the events in

question. (Dkt. No. 10). Plaintiff presumably provided this information in his Amended Complaint because he believes it will be helpful in identifying the officers in question, and the Attorney General's Office is directed to take the information into account as part of its efforts to identify the officers, as required by Judge Ho's *Valentin* Order.

If Plaintiff's question regarding his "response" to Judge Ho's *Valentin* Order refers to his Amended Complaint filed on April 4, 2024, the Court can assure him that the Amended Complaint has been received. As such, his request for an extension of time to respond to the Court's *Valentin* Order is denied as moot. However, if Plaintiff is referring to a different mailing than his Amended Complaint then he should specify as such by letter no later than **May 3, 2024**.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York
April 22, 2024



GARY STEIN
United States Magistrate Judge